CHRISTMAS SUGGESTION: *A WEEKLY CASE OF DYNAMITE*

HUMAN EVENTS is the equivalent of a weekly case of dynamite — the most dramatic, dynamic and explosive of all Christmas gifts.

See page 544

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 44 November 3, 1960 Section I — News

GOLD: *Glittering issue for Nixon* .....(529)

BIGOTRY: *Democrats exploit the issue* .....(529)

NIXON: *Hard punching finish expected* .....(530)

ROCKY: *Campaigning in slow motion* .....(530)

KENNEDY: *His inconsistencies bared* .....(532)

Gold Crisis: Nixon starkly set the stage for the biggest campaign issue of all in Pittsburgh last week when he said, "The gyrations of the London gold market are flashing an important message to Americans: We must keep the dollar sound."

The Vice President went on to charge that the very policies (high spending) pushed by Kennedy are enough in themselves to "cause a run" on the American gold reserves that could have "grim consequences" for the whole free world.

Nixon emphasized that Kennedy's big spending plans will weaken the dollar and that this, in turn, will "gut our savings, dilute the buying power of our paychecks, and reduce the value of our pensions and social security."

Is this just "campaign oratory"? On October 24 the authoritative London *Times* said editorially that "gold comes into its own when faith is being lost in currency, and last week's flurry [in the gold market] was a culmination of doubts about the American dollar. The dollar has been under suspicion for some time and the feeling that Senator Kennedy, with a far more inflationary program than Vice President Nixon, was gaining ground in the Presidential election campaign added considerably to the doubts." On the same day the *Daily Mail* reported evidence that some of the buying (which forced up gold on the market) was by "American financiers fearful that Kennedy will defeat Nixon in the campaign."

The well-informed Financial Editor of the New York *Journal-American*, Leslie Gould, wrote on October 24 that the sharp rise in the gold price "was touched off by London reports Senator Kennedy has hinted privately that if elected he will revalue the dollar" (that is raise the US purchase price in gold, a highly inflationary measure). This would be in line with the inflationary thinking of his No. 1 economic adviser—Harvard Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, who is also rumored as Kennedy's leading choice for Secretary of the Treasury.

Raymond Moley, *Newsweek* and syndicated newspaper columnist, commented that to stop this gold crisis and developing fear among investors, Kennedy "must give specifications about how he can give away all he has promised to interest groups and still balance the budget, prevent inflation, and keep the dollar sound. What will he use for money? What new taxes, and on whom? How much would his program cost?"

Old-timers in the Capital's press corps wonder if the culmination of the campaign might not prove similar to the situation during the gold crisis in Britain late in 1931, when Prime Minister Ramsay McDonald won in the general election campaign on the slogan "save the pound." McDonald dramatized the alternative by displaying worthless German marks issued during the catastrophic German inflation of 1923—a device which Nixon might consider.

Democrats and Bigotry: Unproven charges by John Kennedy's younger brother, Robert, that the Republicans were openly distributing bigotry sheets in San Diego, California, have brought a sharp response from Vice President Nixon's press secretary, Herbert Klein. Robert Kennedy so far has failed to prove his accusation, and Klein said a check with the San Diego office confirms that his attack is "untrue."

Klein then lambasted the Democrats for obviously attempting to "exploit the religious issue to solidify what they regard as the 'Catholic' vote." He denounced the continued use of the film of Kennedy's Houston speech—ostensibly shown to ease Protestant minds regarding the relationship between Rome and American Catholics—in largely Catholic areas.

And he warned that "if this type of smear continues, Richard Nixon may have no choice but to discuss the tactics of our opponents."

• The Democratic-controlled Senate Privileges and Elections subcommittee is investigating the distribution to ministers of a Dallas sermon by the Rev. W. A. Criswell which expressed opposition to the election of a Catholic President. The Democrats have been intimating that pro-Nixon sources are responsible for its distribution.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the Dallas *Morning News* exclusively reported October 24 that the Democratic chief counsel of the subcommittee has in his possession an affidavit signed by the owner of a New York mailing house which states that the 102,225 Criswell pamphlets were distributed not to help Nixon, but as part of a campaign to help Lyndon Johnson get the Democratic Presidential nomination.

The *Morning News* reported that, according to the mailing house owner, the man who paid for the material "said it was essential that the pamphlets reach the ministers before the Democratic convention."

Goldwater and Nixon: Senator Goldwater, in his timely HUMAN EVENTS article "Conservatives Should Support Nixon," argued that right-wingers in the GOP should strive to detach Nixon from his "liberalism." "I think if we Conservatives," remarked the Arizonan, "continue to argue intelligently against such [liberal] measures, his mind will be changed, for Nixon's greatest asset, in my opinion, is his proved ability to grow."

Very recently, Goldwater—in an interview on CBS television's "Face the Nation" (October 23)—said: "Mr. Nixon was for destroying the Connally Reservation up until a few weeks ago. I feel that the concerted action and expressions of conservative people in this country, in both parties, caused him to change his mind. Now he suggests a replacement for the Connally Reservation that, as far as I can tell as a layman and as far as my lawyer can tell me, who is a student in this field, is even better and stronger than the Connally Reservation.

"Now, I say this just as an example of what conservatives can do if they will work, and we have been working on Mr. Nixon in this respect."

GOP Fighting Finish: Realizing he trails in many polls and is in a dubious position in most of the key industrial states, Vice President Nixon has definitely taken off his coat and is punching hard. The main question in the minds of most GOP observers is: "Has he taken his aggressive stance too late?"

Nixon's televised Cincinnati speech last week (in which he scorched Kennedy's views on the U-2, the offshore islands and Cuba) was a follow-up to the speech which convinced him that only a tough offensive against Kennedy's positions would win. That was his speech before the American Legion convention in Miami recently. Both he and Kennedy addressed the veterans, but the VP pounded away in what the "liberals" call "old Nixon" style and brought down the house. The Miami *Herald* said three-fourths of the vets polled after the candidates spoke gave Nixon the decided edge for his speech. An applause meter showed the spontaneous reaction to the speeches favoring Nixon by 2-1. Indications are that Nixon will carry his "spirit of Miami" through the close of the campaign in order to belt out Kennedy and his leftist entourage.

Rocky: When the campaign began it appeared that Nelson Rockefeller had finally decided to pitch in and match Barry Goldwater as a tireless campaigner for the GOP ticket. Goldwater has been setting a tough pace.

But Rocky's efforts at best have been half-hearted; many New York GOP politicos report that he spends as much time praising his own record as Governor as he does the merits of Nixon-Lodge. The New York *Times* recently reported that when Nelson does speak out for Nixon, it is in a qualified manner.

A recent example is Rocky's refusal to back the Vice President's defense of American prestige. Although he has a good following among New York's Negroes, Nelson spent his recent tour of colored areas preaching lay sermons in praise of sit-ins and civil rights legislation—without once mentioning the Republican ticket.

Speculation grows as to the effect this attitude will have on Rocky's political fortunes should the Republicans lose New York while losing the Presidency. If Kennedy wins and New York is lost by 100,000 or less, the Governor's lack of vigor won't soon be forgotten. "Runout Rocky in '60" could well become a telling factor at the 1964 Republican convention, should this be a year of GOP defeat. And, it is reasoned, if Nixon wins without carrying New York, it could be "curtains" for Rocky's whole political future.

Food Prices: America's farmers and consumers are being forewarned by an old hand who has learned many bitter lessons—former (under FDR) Secretary of Agriculture and 1948 Progressive party Presidential candidate Henry Wallace.

Wallace stated last week that "next to war and peace" the farm and food problem was the most vital—and that Kennedy strikes out on the issue.

Said Wallace: "I've analyzed the Kennedy program as carefully as possible and it boils down to a rehash of the proposals put forward by the left wing of the Farmers Union in 1933. A rough calculation that I've made shows the Kennedy proposals would increase the price of food to the consumer by 50 per cent or would bring a 25 per cent decrease in the nation's food supply."

Lifelong farm student Wallace estimates that Kennedy's farm plan would raise wheat prices from about $1.70 a bushel to $3, corn from $1 to $2 a bushel and hogs from $15 to at least $25.

"In New York this would mean that in general meat would jump 20 cents a pound, eggs would go up 20 to 30 cents a dozen and milk five to 10 cents a quart," Wallace predicted.

Nuclear Testing: Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon clashed significantly over the issue of nuclear testing in their fourth debate, but it was little noticed by the press.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon said the Russians were obviously "filibustering" in negotiations on a nuclear test ban in Geneva which have been dragging on ever since October 31, 1958, when Russia and the US agreed to suspend all tests.

Nixon said, furthermore, there is evidence to show Russia has violated the test moratorium and that if an agreement is not reached by January, 1961, *the US should resume fallout-free underground nuclear experiments which are essential in developing our nuclear weapons' system. The Russians, he promised, will "have to fish, or cut bait." (Nixon subsequently extended the time period to February* 1.)

Kennedy took a much different stand. He took no cognizance of the fact the Russians have been stalling endlessly, and he refused to lay down a timetable for the negotiations. He said the next President must "try once again" and only then, if we failed to agree on a test ban, would "the responsibility . . . be clearly with the Russians." Even if we failed, Kennedy would not demand resumption of tests. He said only that "there *may* have to be testing."

Kennedy's Liberalism: One of the wind machines in the frequently conflicting chorus of such loudspeakers boosting the Massachusetts man is the one alleging that the Fabian Socialists' 100% favorite is "not so liberal" as he seems. This line, of course, is directed at conservatives or middle-of-the-roaders.

It makes little impress on Capitol Hill, where Kennedy's 100% rating on the left-wing Americans for Democratic Action voting score sheet is well known. Senator Kennedy's solidly "liberal" voting record in recent years and his partiality for the policies urged by the AFL-CIO are better known in Congress than elsewhere.

Down South, one of the spokesmen for Kennedy who peddles this line is Governor Hodges of North Carolina. Thus the Charlotte, N. C., *Observer* (October 15) reported that the Governor promised Democratic party workers "that Kennedy is no radical . . . . 'He told me I could assure my friends that if he is elected he will listen to the conservatives in the party.' The governor backed into support of the national ticket with assurances that Kennedy was paying only lip service to Democratic platform provisions that have raised Southern ire." Additionally, Hodges asserted that Kennedy "doesn't want to do away with the right-to-work law."

If the Demos Win: In the possible event of a Kennedy Democratic victory, conservatives become increasingly alarmed at the prospects for a Kennedy cabinet and the leadership of the Senate majority in the new Congress. It is felt the "leftish-liberal" Democrats who would fill these positions would implement policies extremely harmful to the free-enterprise system and throw a king-size monkey wrench into our anti-Communist alliance with such nations as Formosa and West Germany. Who would fill these Democratic posts?

Adlai Stevenson is, of course, slated for Secretary of State or UN Ambassador. The prospect of the fine hand of Stevenson in a Kennedy Administration has already caused deep consternation among officials of West Germany. Last week, the Baltimore *Sun's* Bonn correspondent reported how German officials detected Adlai's voice in Kennedy's remarks on the U-2 incident and Quemoy and Matsu, and how they privately indicated they want Nixon instead of Kennedy to succeed Ike.

Chester Bowles is also frequently mentioned for Secretary of State. Bowles rates a flat zero on the ACA conservative voting index, sees almost eye to eye with Stevenson, agrees with Kennedy on Quemoy and Matsu and has espoused the "two-China" theory which calls for recognition of Red China as well as Formosa.

Harvard professor John Kenneth Galbraith, who has an oil portrait of Stevenson posted above his mantlepiece, has the inside track for Secretary of the Treasury. He favors deficit financing, greater public spending; and his latest book, *The Liberal Hour*, calls for price and wage controls.

Archibald Cox looms as Kennedy's Secretary of Labor. He is Kennedy's key adviser and his attitude toward big labor unions is expressed in his textbook for Harvard students which excoriates big business but justifies the labor union's right "to exercise the power of a monopolist."

A Democratic victory might also have drastic effects in the House and Senate. Mike Mansfield (D.-Mont.), now party whip, is in line to succeed Lyndon Johnson as Senate Majority Leader. He rates only 8 per cent conservative on the ACA-Index (Lyndon rates 10 per cent). He is "labor's" man, having voted against every amendment to strengthen Kennedy's labor "reform" bill introduced in the Senate last year. He stands with Stevenson on foreign policy, supported the Morse-Lehman amendment to the 1955 Formosan resolution which excluded Quemoy and Matsu from US protection.

Senator J. William Fulbright would still preside over the Foreign Relations Committee. Fulbright on October 10 of this year declared Red China should be admitted to the United Nations and also described Quemoy and Matsu as "indefensible."

Labor and the Public Welfare: Labor unions averaged one strike every four days at Air Force missile bases in the 12-month period ended last June, according to figures recently compiled by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The group disclosed that hardest hit were intercontinental ballistic missile sites at Vandenberg, California; Warren, Wyoming; and Cape Canaveral, Florida. In 95 strikes, 78,400 man days were lost, most of them at these four bases.

SENATOR JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat from Mississippi: "I know of no publication being published in America today that has such a fine selectivity of public questions and which treats these questions in such a concise, informative manner. I look forward to receiving it every week and I have recommended it to many of my friends as one of the best sources of Washington information."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chamber based its findings on Department of Defense figures previously made available only to Congressmen. ICBM construction now lags behind six months because of union work stoppages and governmental mismanagement.

According to the Defense Department statistics, union strikes against neutral employers (secondary boycotts) and union (jurisdictional) strikes to get work done by other unions accounted for much of the lost time.

Passage of the Common Situs Picketing Bill pushed by Senator Kennedy and Company to legalize secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes at construction sites would lead to further delays in the ICBM program.

Let's Look at the Record: Here follow some statements by Senator Kennedy on controversial subjects which do not harmonize with his "campaign oratory" of recent weeks:

On the Off-shore Islands of China. "How well we learned that lesson, to be more precise and compare strength, may soon be tested in the case of Quemoy and Matsu. I do not think there is greater folly than to leave our commitment in that area as vague as the Secretary of State has left it. If the Chinese should assume we are not going to come to the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, and it is the intention of the US to come to the aid of those islands, we could find ourselves embroiled in a struggle which could lead to a major political action and perhaps to disaster for all of us, East and West." August 14, 1958. Congressional Record, Volume 104, Part 14, page 17572, 85th Congress, 2nd Session.

On aid to Latin America (Kennedy now bitterly criticizes failure of the Ike Administration to give aid to our neighbors to the South).

"Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Chairman, I offered a similar amendment to cut the military assistance to the South American republics last year, and I am offering it again now to cut $20,000,000. It does not seem to me that there is any use spending as large an amount of money as this on military equipment to South American countries." Congressional Record, Volume 98, Part 7, page 8494, June 28, 1952. 82nd Congress, 2nd Session. (Kennedy's amendment was rejected 109-104.)

Capitol Camera: Kennedy campaign literature shows the photograph of a run down house in West Virginia as an example of poverty under the Eisenhower Administration. The *Jackson Herald*, of Ripley, W. Virginia, reports that the house was damaged by a highway building program and left unrepaired by the owner after he had been paid $7,000 in damages.

• *The Nationalities Division of the Republican National Committee is now distributing Nixon buttons in Polish, Ukrainian, Czech, Lithuanian, Chinese, French, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Slavic, German, Armenian and Hungarian.*

• The daughter of the late Governor Alfred E. Smith, Mrs. Emily Smith Warner, has come out for Nixon.

• *Senator Kennedy has endorsed President Truman's discredited proposal that the President have the right to seize industrial plants during "emergencies." Apparently, the GOP National Committee notes, Kennedy wants to become "Little Seizer."*

• Kennedy claims that the US "had the lowest rate of economic growth, which means jobs, of any major industrial society in the world in 1959." The facts: During 1959 the US economy grew 6.9 per cent. This rate was greater than Italy's 6.2 per cent, West Germany's 5.8 per cent, the United Kingdom's 2.7 per cent, and France's 2.4 per cent—all for the same year.

• *The National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups, speaking in behalf of 67 affiliated organizations with a combined membership of 18 million, last week scored Kennedy's off-shore island stand as "part and parcel of the disastrous 'appeasement and retreat' policy advocated for many years by the pro-Soviet Hiss-Acheson clique in the US Department of State."*

• Walter Reuther on October 25 came out with a thinly-veiled endorsement of Kennedy in a full-page ad in the New York *Times*. The Reuther-signed ad was from an editorial in the official United Auto Workers paper, *Solidarity*, voicing the familiar Democratic campaign arguments. In short, Reuther, who has kept out of the campaign spotlight, now feels the Democratic ticket has the better chance to win and therefore it is safe for him to unmask his batteries.

• *Kennedy has often been at odds with the American Legion on major issues, but his most intemperate blast at the veterans' organization came in 1949 when he said on the House floor, in regard to the Legion's opposition to a housing bill he favored, "The leadership of the American Legion has not had a constructive thought for the benefit of this country since 1918."*

• Big reason Nixon-Lodge are currently leading in Texas: the active support of former Governor Allan Shivers, head of the state's conservative Democrats.

CORRECTION: HUMAN EVENTS last week reported that Jack Kennedy had been paired against the Formosan Defense Treaty in 1955. This is in error. He was in Key West, Florida, at the time of the vote and took no position. Kennedy was paired, however, in favor of an amendment that would have specifically excluded Quemoy and Matsu from the pact.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR.
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER ALLAN H. RYSKIND
Editorial Assistant: BARBARA STAMBAUGH *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
--- COMMENTARY

What appears to be a bonanza for people, obtained without hard work and without payment of taxes to the Government, actually turns out to be a galloping increase in the cost of living, destruction of hard-earned savings and, ultimately economic chaos and hardship.
—ROBERT B. ANDERSON, *Secretary of the Treasury*

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 44 — Section II November 3, 1960

The Michigan Mess

By Holmes Alexander

One man digs the grave—another lies in it. This is the approximate situation between Michigan's Governor G. Mennen Williams and his successor, Lieutenant Governor Swainson (D), or Professor Paul Bagwell (R).

As the five-time head of the State Government, now spavined with debt and foundered with overstuffings of "welfare" and bureaucracy, Williams has almost inevitably doomed the next man to be a miserable one-termer. To the itinerant reporter, the wonder is that either party was able to find a serious candidate.

Michigan is a ramblin' wreck. The Democratic party is indistinguishable from the Laborite Movement which is dominated by Walter Reuther and Gus Scholle. The result is a soak-the-corporation philosophy which is running big companies over the border to other Lake States. When a new plant is announced for construction, it will almost surely be a small one with little effect upon the job hunger. The gone-crazy welfare system has brought about such lulus as building more university dormitories than the enrollment warranted—requiring a tearing down of the academic standards to fill up the empty bedrooms. There are so many people on the State payroll that Michiganders pay $1,000 per capita to support them, as against $400 in neighboring Ohio. With a sales tax limited to three per cent by the constitution, no income tax and a sinking base for corporation taxation, the State will ballot this year on a proposition to permit the legislature to raise consumer taxes.

Democratic and Republican candidates are essentially divided along the lines indicated by this economic crisis. John Swainson, a handsome and personable 35, who unexpectedly got the Democratic nomination after Secretary of State James Hare offended the Labor Barons, appears to be a bosses' boy. He manages to take positions against realistic taxation and a Constitutional Amendment leading to legislative reapportionment which is gerrymandered for Republican domination. The Labor bosses want to do it much faster. Swainson is the prisoner of the Laborite propaganda machine which cannot admit that anything much is wrong with Michigan after ten years of Williams.

Paul Bagwell, a somewhat loquacious ex-professor of public speaking and "communications," takes the other side on most debatable points. He is pro-sales tax, pro-reapportionment and promises to bring 90,000 more positions to Michigan. In 1958 Bagwell held Williams to a 147,000 majority, very low among Democrats, and harped on the "economic climate" which makes big companies feel like convicts in a death cell—disinclined to read continued stories or make long-term commitments. The GOP candidate now rejoices in the motto: "Bagwell Means Jobs."

THE KINDLY AUNT AND THE POOR LITTLE RICH BOY

Most people want to work, but many feel that a Demo-Laborite Governor will take better care of them in case of a depression. The Iron Law of State paternalism has been fastened upon this Reutherian stronghold to a degree that makes self-liberation an uncertainty. A German-American told how a relative in East Germany has joined the Communist party—it was a case of join or starve. A Michigan Negro, when pressed by a Bagwell manager to defy the UAW-CIO and come out for the Republican ticket, used almost identical language, saying: "Without a union card, I don't work." The Laborite disciple in bloc votes teaches straight-ticket voting.

But this year there is a possible counter-force in action. Congressman Alvin Bentley, GOP Senate candidate, told your reporter: "Win or lose, I'm going to teach them to split a ticket." The lean and keen Congressman spent 9 years in the Foreign Service before entering Congress. Having served behind the Iron Curtain in Hungary, he made contacts throughout East Europe and has been most helpful to the Hungarian, Polish and German groups which have substantial votes that usually go to the Democrats.

Bentley, 41, is pitted against US Senator Pat McNamara, 67, once head of a plumber's union and still an unpretending Laborite hack with a record of never opposing a spending bill. In a speech at

(Continued on Page 534)

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy Wrong About Urban Ills

From the Chicago Tribune

Senator Kennedy called a conference on urban problems in Pittsburgh and made a speech about the "shameful record of neglect" of the cities. He put all the blame on the Republicans who, he said, had prevented the cities from getting larger grants of federal tax funds for urban renewal, public housing, private housing, public schools, hospitals, mass transportation, stream pollution, air pollution, and juvenile delinquency.

Since the Democrats have been in control of the purse strings in Congress for the last six years, they surely ought to share the blame. And since Democratic political machines have been in charge of most of the big cities for many years, they might be held accountable for some of the "neglect."

The slums which grieve Senator Kennedy and other good citizens are largely the result of a breakdown in local law enforcement. Democratic politicians in many cities failed to enforce building and housing laws. Democratic politicians tolerated or sponsored corrupt police departments, permitting crime to flourish.

Protected the Unions

A vast quantity of shoddy housing has been erected since the end of the war. Much of this will be new slums in a few years. Decent housing has become so expensive that many families cannot afford to pay for it. For these faults the Democrats again must share the blame. They initiated the various federal programs which inflated the demand for housing and drove up its cost. They protected the labor unions with unreasonable building codes and encouraged union featherbedding.

Other items in Mr. Kennedy's list of urban problems are matters which the cities could solve themselves if the Democratic mayors were willing and able to raise local taxes. They are not willing to do so because tax increases are unpopular; it is much easier to pass the buck to Washington.

If Mr. Kennedy really wished to help the cities he would advocate federal budget cuts which would permit the cities to share some of the tax sources now sucked dry by the federal government. He would demand an end of inflation which has been raising city expenses. He would urge the labor unions to give an honest day's work on city projects.

Mr. Kennedy's talk about a "shameful record of neglect" of the cities is mostly bunk.

COMMENTARY reprints available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30.

Nationalists Have Proved 'Defensibility' of Quemoy

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The Democratic National Chairman, Senator Henry ("Scoop") Jackson, is guilty of flagrant distortion when he attempts to show that Admiral Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, supports Jack Kennedy on Quemoy and Matsu.

Jackson claims that Burke feels the two islands are "both indefensible and strategically worthless." Nothing could be further from the truth. Burke's position, spelled out in October of 1958 and repeated since, is crystal clear; that Chiang Kai-shek must be backed to the hilt and that the islands can be held "forever."

'49 Invasion Failed

Despite the assertions of Kennedy's "experts" (one, the late Admiral Harry Yarnell, retired 21 years ago) the two islands are hardly "indefensible." The Communists tried to overrun Quemoy in 1949 with an amphibious invasion of 20,000 men. Seven thousand were captured, the rest killed or drowned.

The present Nationalist troops are superbly trained and equipped. The heavy 8-inch artillery provided by the US and the 155-mm howitzers are now encased in concrete and shielded with earth. An extensive subterranean tunnel system enables the Nationalists to move supplies and troops without exposing them to mainland fire. Nationalist pilots fly the late-model US jets, equipped with deadly air-to-air Sidewinder missiles.

Impossible for Large Craft

Military experts are unable to see how the Communists can successfully take the two islands. Invasion by sea, futile in 1949, is discounted for geographical reasons. Tidal flats extending 1,200 yards seaward lie off the northern and northwestern beaches, where the Reds would have to land. This prohibits use of large landing craft and the Reds would have to use, as they did in 1949, junks and bamboo rafts.

General Laurence Kuter, the Air Force's Pacific Commander in Chief, tells why the Chinese Communists did not risk such an invasion in 1958, despite their threats:

"The Chinese Nationalists were well entrenched on the hilly islands with every approach covered from concerte emplacements. Beaches were mined and barricaded. President Chiang's forces were itching for a fight and probably could have inflicted heavy casualties on the Communists. In this event, a primary Chicom (Chinese Communist) objective to gain prestige in Asia would be defeated and they would lose face."

There are equally compelling reasons that the Communists did not in 1958, and will not now, try to take the islands by air. Communist pilots are simply no match for the Nationalists, and after the Nationalists racked up a 31-2 kill ratio the Communists grounded their planes.

Nationalist Pilots Excel

Two typical air battles will demonstrate the superiority of the Chinese pilots (many of whom have 1,400 hours flying in the F-86 alone). On September 19, 1958, four Communist torpedo boats went out to intercept two Nationalist LST's engaging in the resupply of Quemoy. As the torpedo boats approached the convoy, they were hit by Chinese Sabrejets. Three of the four boats were destroyed.

Two waves of Communist MIG's then appeared, apparently a little late for their rendezvous with the boats, and found themselves in a fight with the F-86's. Outnumbered, the Nationalists still killed five MIG's. No Nationalist plane was hit.

11 MIG's Downed

A similar battle occurred five days later when the Nationalists were ambushed over the Formosan Straits. The battle ranged over the straits for hundreds of miles from Wenchow to Swatow. When it was over the Nationalists had downed 11 MIG's. The Nationalists were unharmed.

The Communists cannot attack by sea and they cannot attack by air. Their odd-day shelling of Quemoy continues, but it is only a face-saving device. There appears to be no way that Quemoy and Matsu can fall to Red hands. No way, that is, other than the Kennedy proposal for strategic retreat.

More Federal Employees?

"Senator Kennedy, in effect, wants to get the farmer out of farming. He wants to make him just another Government employee."

—Senator Kenneth B. Keating

The Michigan Mess

(Continued from page 533)

Ann Arbor from the Kennedy campaign train rear platform, McNamara remarked: "I have one more point to make" —causing shouts from the crowd. "Oh, no!"—"You've made it."

But the old campaigner only grinned and waved. He had confidence in the straight-ticket voting!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Truman Says Defend Isles

On October 14, 1958, former President Truman wrote: "We cannot regard Quemoy and Matsu as just two isolated and unimportant items in the Communist scheme, as of little or no importance to us.

"The islands are symbols, if not steps, to test our policy of firmness and our determination to resist—with force if necessary—the Communist technique of piecemeal conquest.

"As I see it and understand it, Quemoy and Matsu are current symbols of what we have experienced in the Communist probing activities in Azerbaijan, Greece, Turkey, Berlin and Korea. And there are many other places where we may expect the Communists to make the trouble.

"Dictators never settle down; they always want more."

Easy Street

Father, must I go to work?
No, my son;
We're living now on Easy Street
On dough from Washington.

We've left it up to Uncle Sam,
So don't get exercised;
Nobody has to give a dam—
We've all been Subsidized.

But if Uncle Sam treats us all so well,
And feeds us milk and honey;
Please, daddy, tell me what in Hell
He's going to use for money?

Don't worry, son, there's not a hitch,
In this here noble plan
He simply soaks the filthy rich
And helps the Common Man.

But Father, won't there come a time
When they run out of cash—
When we have left them not a dime,
And things will go to smash!

My faith in you is shrinking, son,
You noisy little brat;
My faith in you is shrinking, son,
To be a Democrat!

The Kennedy stand is now so strong that it may be said he has given a campaign promise to the world that, if elected, he will negotiate the Nationalist Chinese out of, and the Red Chinese into, these islands . . . . Surrender of these islands is the official party line of the Liberal Leftists of the Democratic party. Indeed, you can hardly hold your head high as a "Lunatic Leftist" or "A Share America" man without a fixed attitude on Quemoy-Matsu . . . . And you must accept the proposition that Quemoy and Matsu are militarily useless and indefensible. —Holmes Alexander

Benson Blasts Kennedy Farm Program

Secretary of Agriculture Benson: The Kennedy Farm Program would mean that a "host of government inspectors would be breathing down farmers' necks. It could turn many rural communities into ghost towns. It could shrink the per capita supply of beef and pork to a level lower than in the grim days of rationing in World War II. Virtually no farm product would move into export without a large subsidy. Tariff walls would have to be raised sky high to keep out foreign farm products. Synthetic fibers would soon take over the markets of many farm-grown crops. Khrushchev would probably make good his boast to exceed us in production of milk and meat. . . . It is a one-way ticket to disaster for US agriculture. It is shrinkmanship not growthmanship."

Reuther Soils Election Campaign With Insulting Play on Bigotry

By Raymond Moley

Four facts about Walter Reuther, president of the CIO and the UAW, have never before been doubted. One is that he is the second most powerful figure in the American labor movement.

Another is that he is a devoted believer in government control of American industry. Another is that he has for 25 years been moving to bring the Democratic Party under the control of the politically minded union leaders. Another was that he had the smartest, most acute brain among all the political labor leaders.

Reason for Doubt

Now there is reason to have grave doubts about the last of these hitherto conceded facts. The nationwide publicity which has revealed Reuther's obtuseness comes because it has been brought out by a person no less than the President of the United States. By now the whole story is known over the nation and it needs little elaboration here.

But its importance moves me to mention once more in these articles the issue of religion. More than a month ago, I wrote that I should not bring it up again, saying that the subject should be avoided by both candidates and by all responsible political writers. I believed then that only a few members of any religion would vote their prejudices rather than their concept of the worth of the two candidates.

Reuther is Influential

But Reuther is not a single, irresponsible peddler of fanatacism or even the head of a small group of fanatics. He is a public figure of great importance. His voice and his influence are known everywhere. He serves on governmentally appointed committees and commissions. He lectures in colleges and universities. He is listened to abroad. Why?

Because he speaks for more than a million free American wage-earners—members of all religions, and respected members of their communities.

Granted, foolish and irresponsible people have attacked Kennedy because of his religion. That has been repudiated by Mr. Nixon. But when a pamphlet which injects religion into the campaign is inserted in the publication of Walter Reuther's UAW and distributed to members who are of all faiths, the issue or responsibility is pertinent. This scurrilous leaflet was not limited to Detroit. More than a million copies were distributed to UAW members; additional numbers were printed and circulated by the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education.

No Room for Opposition?

Where does this leave those Americans who are not bigots but who oppose Kennedy legitimately because of his inexperience, his views on foreign affairs, and his economic radicalism? Reuther's publication says in effect that those who vote against Kennedy are bigots and enemies of liberty. I am one of those Americans, and I deeply resent this. Thousands of others—members of all religions—will resent it also.

Reuther has compounded his blunder by his statement that the smear has been "misrepresented." This is a weak and disingenuous statement. This publication of the UAW cannot be misinterpreted. It is a summons to a profoundly deep and cruel division among our people. It is also an irreparable injury to the labor movement which Reuther has exploited for political purposes.

Respectful as I am of college professors and dazzled as I am by sons of great wealth, I often wonder why both tend to mistake socialism for liberalism and to presume that conservatism is a cuss word. Such presumptions are gone out of fashion now. Perhaps it is because both groups, in spite of all their advantages, are underprivileged. They have no direct contact with the competitive, private free enterprise system which makes America click.

—John Temple Graves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Giveaways Breed Our National Peril

By Joseph Ator

Vice President Nixon, during his TV joust with Senator Kennedy, apparently hit the nail on the head when he was asked what he proposed to do about the flight of gold from the United States. At least, all that Senator Kennedy offered in ri-poste was a meek "me, too," plus some pious hopes on expanding American trade, which would be lovely work if he could get it.

The deficit in our international balance of payments, which year after year has left European countries and their citizens with mounting claims of our shrinking gold hoard, derives primarily from our public spending. The private citizens of the United States, in spite of all the talk about high wages pricing us out of export markets, do pretty well in approximating a balance of trade.

Saved Western Europe

It is the giveaways that constitute our national peril. Single handed in the world, we undertook the task of picking up Western Europe and Japan after the bombs stopped falling, dusting them off, and setting them on the road to prosperity. We financed them in organizing defenses against communism and paid for such ill-fated adventures as France's effort to hold on to its Asian empire.

Now every country in the world, including all of those that are newly created and have shown little if any capacity to run their own affairs, wants to become industrialized and prosperous.

Others Must Pay

Nixon, like Kennedy, is committed to all this fol-de-rol, oblivious to the difficulties of merging cannibalism with electronics, and thus was prevented from voicing the opinion shared by so many of his fellow citizens that the whole thing is tomfoolery. He did the next best thing. He suggested that if we are going to pay the tribal societies of Africa and Asia not to turn Communist, a bigger part of the bill should be met by the Europeans and Japanese, whom we have restored to prosperity.

Editors of the bulletin of the First National City Bank of New York, in their current issue, have toted up our gross and net financial expenditures in the operation of nearly a score of international economic aid programs. Largely since the end of World War II, the United States authorized the spending of $48.6 billion and spent, net $27.9 billion after repayment of $4.7 billion in loans to the Export-Import and World Banks.

A second table listed the payments of the industrialized countries of the world in the program of more immediate concern—assistance to "less developed nations" from 1954 through 1959. In six years the United States has contributed $12.3 billion and all of the other industrialized free countries $5.9 billion.

All but a smattering of the other countries' contributions came from France ($3.8 billion) and Britain ($1.6 billion). The French spent most of their money in a belated and largely futile effort to hold their empire together. Three white British dominions, Japan, and eight European countries put up, among them, only a little more than a billion dollars.

Russia's Role

The contributions of our allies, lackadaisical as they have been, still have outstripped those of Russia, which our international alarmists keep screaming that we must "match." The bank letter estimated that since 1954 Russia, aided in a modest way by its European satellites and Red China, has spent $3 billion largely in interest bearing loans, to underdeveloped countries.

Of course the Russians, with no inhibitions about attaching strings to their money, have unquestionably gained more, dollar for dollar, than have we.

The First National City economists point out that intergovernmental financing of productive enterprise is a comparatively new thing, dating from the collapse of international credit brought about by the great depression. The United States and other developing nations financed their development by borrowing from private lenders abroad and in spite of a few defaults on one side and interest rates commensurate with such risks on the other, both parties benefited in the long run.

"Soft Loans"

With such a multiplicity of governmental lending agencies in operation that committees have had to be set up to channel would-be borrowers to the right agency, the mere competition of "soft" government loans makes it difficult for private lenders to operate in the field. We are hurt in two ways, the bulletin found.

Borrowing nations are freed from the discipline they have to exert on themselves if they want private loans. And as taxpayers we have to put up the money to finance undertakings that private financial agencies, to which we entrust our savings, often wouldn't touch with a 10 foot pole.

Kennedy Sees His Administration As Source of all Human Welfare

By Walter Trohan

Senator Kennedy said in a campaign speech at Oakland, California, that Republicans "have opposed progress and I think their time is coming to an end." Then he offered some general judgments which seemed to satisfy him that the case was made.

"There is no new Republican party and no old Republican party," he said. "There is only the same Republican party which, for half a century, has opposed every single progressive measure which has been designed to improve human welfare and reduce human misery."

This sounds like a pretty sweeping impeachment until you examine Senator Kennedy's specifications. These are that the Republican party was not enthusiastic about public housing, public power projects, rural electrification, the Tennessee Valley authority, or farm price support.

So it is apparent that Senator Kennedy can visualize only one source of welfare. That is the federal government in Washington—in his mind, the bringer of all good things. Unless the government takes the people's money from them in taxes and spends it for them on things that the government itself decides they are to have, then it isn't "progressive" and "welfare" is not advanced.

This is a curious view of government in a country which has always prided itself on the fact that its social organization was designed to give individual effort and private responsibility the fullest possible play. The stated philosophy of Senator Kennedy provides a point of departure in demonstrating how the Democratic Presidential candidate differs from his Republican opposition.

The Republican party is not obsessed with the idea that the only "positive" accomplishments of this country are those launched through government. Muscular displays of government in action may look impressive, but the sad truth is that they do great harm quite as often as they achieve small good.

Vicious Cycle

Dr. John H. Stambaugh, vice-chancellor of Vanderbilt University:

"The historical cycle of the body politic indicates that man progresses from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance; then comes the waning, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependency, and from dependency right back into bondage again."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol XVII, No. 44 — Section III

HUMAN EVENTS

November 3, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Religious Issue

How the Kennedy Camp Keeps it Alive

By Congressman William E. Miller
Chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee

I SPEAK AS A CATHOLIC and out of a sense of outrage. I charge that *those running the Kennedy campaign* are deliberately keeping the religious issue alive and inflamed—apparently in the hope that this will produce more votes for Senator Kennedy from among our fellow Catholics. *The campaign is calculated, nationwide and extremely well financed.*

Vice President Nixon and the Republican Party have tried to keep religion out of the campaign by not mentioning it and by forbidding any discussion of it by those working in the campaign. In the third television debate before millions of American families, Vice President Nixon declared:

"I repudiate anybody who uses the religious issue. I will not tolerate it. I have ordered all my people to have nothing to do with it."

If the Kennedy forces had gone along, there would have been a minimum of religious strife. They did not—they have been playing up Kennedy's religion in ways which they think will get him votes.

The campaign to win the Presidency for Senator Kennedy by exploiting the religious issue actually began at the Democratic National Convention in 1956. It was used with telling effect in the primaries in 1960 and again in the Democratic Convention this year.

It is being used today as a massive *"bigotry in reverse"* propaganda campaign the purpose of which is to imply that any vote against Kennedy is a vote for bigotry.

I believe that the intelligence and patriotism of Catholic voters is insulted and damaged by assertions that they are gullible enough to vote for a candidate for high office merely because he is a fellow Catholic.

We are certain that Catholics, like other Americans, will vote in 1960 for the man best-qualified to administer the affairs of state in this critical age of the 1960's.

But efforts still continue by supporters of Senator Kennedy to keep this religious issue alive. In Detroit, the United Automobile Workers distributed a pamphlet saying the issue is not the men, Nixon vs Kennedy, but "liberty or bigotry." This was promptly and properly denounced by President Eisenhower as *"distortion, falsehood and wrongdoing."* Senator Kennedy, when asked about it, replied that he had not seen it.

The Senator has been endorsed by the sponsors of this appeal to religious bigotry and he has not repudiated them.

THE MICHIGAN FAIR ELECTION PRACTICES COMMISSION, made up of a Catholic priest, a Jewish rabbi and a Protestant bishop, has condemned this leaflet distributed by the United Auto Workers as "Bigotry in reverse." Representatives of these great religious groups have stated that the leaflet distributed by the UAW attempts to raise the religious issue to the political advantage of Senator Kennedy. This leaflet carries on its cover a picture of the Statue of Liberty and a member of the Ku Klux Klan. Behind the cover is a transcript of the very same message by Senator Kennedy for which those managing the Kennedy campaign have been buying expensive television time.

This does not appear to be co-incidence.

The UAW smear sheet is not merely a Michigan matter. We have obtained an identical copy of this sheet published by COPE, the political arm of the AFL-CIO, which has endorsed Kennedy.

COPE's venture into this smear campaign makes it a national issue as COPE is a national organization—the powerful *and well-financed muscle of the Democratic party,* more important and more influential than the Democratic National Committee.

In addition to Michigan, the smear sheet has turned up in Philadelphia and undoubtedly is being distributed elsewhere in the country by the AFL-CIO and COPE.

I challenge George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, to repudiate the publication of this discredited sheet by COPE and to stop its distribution by COPE.

Walter Reuther and COPE are merely the latest of Senator Kennedy's supporters to try to win votes for Kennedy with the religious issue.

The history is a long one:

Senator Kennedy's staff circulated a memorandum in 1956 and in 1960, which argued with cold statistics that Kennedy on the ticket would recover the Catholic vote and win the big states of the north for the Democratic ticket.

McGregor Burns, Kennedy's friendly biographer, has written that Kennedy's strategy to win in 1960 is based on an appeal to a supposed Catholic vote in the big cities.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paul Butler, a pre-convention Kennedy supporter, warned that failure to nominate Kennedy would make Catholic voters retaliate against the Democratic ticket.

The 1956 Kennedy view was reiterated in a poll released on the eve of the 1960 Democratic Convention by *Michael Prendergast*, Democratic chairman in New York State. The Prendergast poll stated that the *"key"* to New York State was *"the Catholic vote."* For what purpose does a political organization make a poll on the basis of religion other than as part of a plan to campaign votes on religious ground?

Governor Michael DiSalle, just a few weeks ago, put out the false charge that Vice President Nixon had been endorsed by the Ku Klux Klan and had not repudiated it.

The current *US News* reports widespread precinct use of a sly religious appeal for Kennedy: "Our precinct workers are gaining access to the homes of Republican Catholics that they have never been able to get into before," said a Democratic spokesman. "Our workers go in and talk about the candidates for Governor and Senator. Finally, they raise the question: 'Do you think they are going to keep Kennedy from being President just because he is a Catholic?' It gets a good response. We are winning lots of new votes."

Time Magazine, in an article clearly based on extensive interviewing of *Bobby Kennedy*, said this:

> "Hard-boiled Kennedyites run a continual poll on the Catholic vote, know that Jack's confrontation by the Houston Protestant ministers (*Time*, Sept. 26) helped them with Nixon-minded Northern Catholics—and know that a fall-off of interest in religion will weaken them in the same area. *Bobby* plans to show a film of Jack Kennedy's session with the Houston clergy in every state."

These plans of *Bobby*, as reported by *Time*, are being carried out now. In New York, Chicago, Baltimore and other northern cities, the Democrats have been re-running on expensive television time a film of Senator Kennedy's appearance before Protestant ministers in Houston, Texas. This inflames the religious issue, it does not quiet it. The intent of the showing of this film is subject to serious question, particularly when it is concentrated in areas where its main effect is not to *answer* anti-Catholic bigotry in the South. I don't think they're trying to create understanding among non-Catholics. I think they are trying to inflame resentment among Catholics. The UAW and COPE brought this out in the open when they presented this Kennedy material as a choice between voting for Kennedy and voting for bigotry.

If this film is being run by Democrats with the calculated objective of keeping the religious issue alive, then all of the Senator's public deplorings of religious considerations are open to very serious question.

This activity is too widespread, its sponsors are too close to Kennedy to consider it as anything but a deliberate attempt to exploit Kennedy's religion and to ask Catholics to vote for him because he is a Catholic rather than because of his qualifications to lead our country and the West against atheistic Communism which would wipe out all religions.

A Southern View of Nixon vs Kennedy

By John Temple Graves

Many don't know what Nixon is talking about when he reproaches Kennedy for "Title Three" advocacy.

"Title Three" was the most intolerable of all the civil force proposals in the 1957 bill. In defeating it the South won a major victory in spite of heavy losses on other points.

Now it turns up in the 1960 campaign.

Answering Scripps-Howard on it, Mr. Kennedy is point blank in favor, as he was before. Mr. Nixon opposes. Title III would let the attorney general bring civil suits to protect every imaginable constitutional right, licensing him as meddler extraordinary and persecutor plenipoteniary to the South. This side of total state or Reconstruction days there would be no comparable tyranny.

Point by point Nixon is revealed as far from the South but nearer than Kennedy, and looking our way.

Wantonly the Kennedy platform would abolish literacy tests for voting. Nixon would not.

Tyrannically Kennedy and company would kill Rule 22 on filibusters and permit closure by simple majority of those present. Mr. Nixon warns against destroying rights of the minority, says the very smallest number which should be allowed to cut off debate is a "constitutional majority of the total membership."

The two stands may be nearly the same but what is important in this and all other instances is the limiting phrase showing South consciousness in Nixon.

There is the fact of Democrats specifying integration by 1963 while Republicans set no time limit.

And the fact that Kennedy wants an FEPC and Nixon does not.

These differences are not "slight," but even those which are may be identified as straws in the wind, showing which way it blows.

The Republican nominee is always aware of the South. The Democratic one is not.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will You Or Galbraith Spend Your Money?

By Leslie Gould

Financial Editor, New York Journal-American

The major economic issue in this Presidential campaign is:

Can bigger, centralized government spend your money—your income—better than you can?

This is the Keynesian theory, originally advanced by the late John Maynard Keynes, British economist, and now taken up by a number of American economists, the most vocal currently being J. Kenneth Galbraith.

Galbraith, a Harvard professor, is the No. 1 economic adviser to Senator John Kennedy and is reported the leading choice for Secretary of the Treasury in the event of a Democratic victory.

Galbraith's position is that Americans are too affluent—spending too much money for things they want—rather than on the things he—Galbraith—thinks they should spend on.

So, he recommends that a bigger slice of the American individual's income be taxed, so that the Federal Government can spend it better and more wisely.

Currently, Government is taking 20 per cent of the country's gross national product. Galbraith thinks it should be more, which would mean that the average citizen would have less to spend on material things. Also, the average citizen's choice would be less.

It just so happens that Galbraith is the author of a recent book called the "Affluent Society." Five years ago, he was the author of another book—"The Great Crash—1929." In publicizing that work, he was a witness before the Fulbright Committee, which was making what it called a "friendly" investigation of the stock market.

Galbraith took a bearish view in a full day of testimony and what he and a couple of Senators said at that time gave the stock market one of its worst one-day shakeouts of the preceding five years.

A column by this reporter on his testimony was headed:

"An 'Egghead' Gives Market a Thorough Scrambling."

Well, the dire predictions did not come about. The market sold off at that time 30 points in the Dow Jones industrial averages to 387.50. This year—nearly five years after the bath of pessimism—the market got to an all-time high of 688.21—300 points above the Galbraith "low." Currently the market is around 600. He thought the market was in such a dangerous position in March of '55 that margins should be 100 per cent.

Last year as the head of a committee of seven economists, Galbraith reported:

"We reject the notion that government governs best which governs least. The Federal Government is our only instrument for guiding the economic destiny of the country."

Who is John Kenneth Galbraith? He is a Canadian by birth. He was part of a left-wing group operating in Washington during the war that sought to sneak over socialism. As deputy administrator of the OPA under Leon Henderson, Galbraith tried to put over grade labelling, which would have killed brand names and advertising.

So great was the uproar over this socialistic move, that Galbraith was forced out of OPA, but later he was back in Washington as director of the State Department's Economic Security Policy.

For five years he served on the editorial board of Henry R. Luce's Fortune magazine before joining the teaching staff of Harvard, where he is now a full professor of economics.

What Galbraith has yet to learn is that this is a consumer economy. That consumption by the nation's 52 million households sets the course for economic growth. Not Government spending and taxing.

Taft's Campaign Reminder

From the Cincinnati Enquirer

A message to remember, taken from the saying of the late Robert A. Taft, was contributed by Representative B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee when friends of Senator Taft gathered in Cincinnati for ceremonies that marked the first day of issue of the four-cent postage stamp in memory of Mr. Taft.

The message which Mr. Reece recalled was this:

Bob Taft said that truth has neither expansion, nor latitude, nor longitude. Either you are right or you are wrong.

"The Senator did what he thought was right regardless of the consequences."

In this period of an intense campaign for President of the United States, in this period of debate in the United Nations on the key issues of the world, there always is the temptation to compromise with truth for the expediency of the moment. To anyone so tempted we emphasize those words of Senator Taft and the esteem in which he is held.

He was chosen, recalled Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, as one of the five all-time greats among the nation's legislators; he is the first member of the Congress to whom a memorial (the Taft bell tower) was built in Washington, a memorial that is the only one built by public subscription as opposed to public funds, and he is the first legislator in whose honor a memorial stamp was issued.

Truth always will outlive expediency.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It's Only Money

A Preview of the Kennedy Big Spend Program

By James L. Wick

What government spending will be like ten years hence if Kennedy becomes President is suggested in a new book "Spend and Survive—The Intelligent Citizen's Guide to Public Spending" ($3.50, Bobbs-Merrill).

Since the book is designed to win converts to the Big Spend Philosophy, it does not give the author's background, which might warn readers of the bias of its contents.

The author, David Demarest Lloyd, was legislation research director of the Americans for Democratic Action, 1947-48; he was on the White House staff, 1948-51; he was administrative assistant to President Truman, 1950-53. After that, he became executive director of the Truman Library.

The book does not mention Kennedy; presumably the manuscript was completed before the Los Angeles convention. Its purpose, like the writings of Galbraith and Schlesinger, is to build popular support for Government Spending as against Private Spending.

The book says National Defense and Foreign Aid now cost $48 billion; by 1970, the author says, we ought to be spending $67.5 billion for this purpose.

Education now costs $19 billion; by 1970, we ought to be spending $39 billion a year.

Government expenditures for Health and Community Development (hospitals, medical research and education, public housing and urban renewal, sanitation and anti-pollution) now amount to $6.7 billion; by 1970 it ought to reach $13.75 billion.

National transportation now costs government $12.5 billion; in 1970, the expenditure ought to be $15 billion.

Land and water resources development now cost $2.8 billion; by 1970, it should cost $5.6 billion.

Expenditures classified by the author as "protection against poverty" now cost $28 billion; by 1970, the total should be $46.5 billion.

Interest on public debt (federal, state, local) now costs $11.4 billion; in 1970, the sum should be $16.5 billion. Lloyd sneers at those who think of the national debt "in terms of horror" and he says it is "silly" to think that the public debt will not increase. This fact is something he apparently has kept secret from Kennedy, who, like FDR, insists that he will balance the budget—except "in time of war or national emergency."

The book jacket summarizes Lloyd's thinking in the following sentence—the emphasis being the publisher's:

"Unless you see to it NOW that the government gets enough money from you and handles it in the right way, the Russians will bury us."

Continues the jacket: "Here is irrefutable proof that government spending does NOT CAUSE INFLATION; false ideas about our economy are unnecessarily scaring us into accepting defeat in the Cold War."

"Government spending feeds the economy," says Lloyd when talking about federal expenditures—which he thinks are good. But spending by state and local governments is not so good. He says (page 244): "State and local debt as we have seen it is not the same sort of thing as the national debt. It lies like a dead weight on personal consumption, which means that it is a dead weight on local business."

You guessed it: The author wants Uncle Sam to assume most of the responsibility for taxing and spending.

Federal expenditures give a lift to the economy, says the author. If big enough, they assure an increase in the gross national product of four to five per cent a year. With such growth, taxes will not have to be increased, continues the author. So all the extras he advocates, you get for nothing.

The more that government takes away from you, the richer you will be. Thus speaketh Lloyd. Thus speaketh Galbraith. Thus speaketh Schlesinger. Thus speaketh John F. Kennedy.

However, there is something that could go wrong, warns Schlesinger. The Kennedy Revolution must be rushed through Congress in "The First Hundred Days"—like FDR's. Otherwise, the "dear dumb masses," as they are looked upon by the beatnik-intellectuals, might take a hard second look. They might wake up. They might stop "The Kennedy Revolution"—dead in its tracks.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of these articles by Congressman William E. Miller, John Temple Graves, Leslie Gould and James L. Wick at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conservatives, Don't Stay at Home!

An Appeal By Conservative Senator Barry Goldwater

Senator Barry Goldwater had an important message for conservatives on October 23 when he appeared on CBS television's "Face the Nation." Pertinent extractions from that telecast are printed below.

STUART NOVINS: **Senator, have you been campaigning for conservatism or for Richard Nixon?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I've been campaigning for Richard Nixon and Cabot Lodge and the Republican party and conservatism, because I feel the Republican party is the only vehicle of conservatism today. There is no such thing anymore as a Jeffersonian Democratic party any place in this United States, except the South, and I can't, for that reason, understand Southern Democrats for one moment embracing the Democratic Platform or the Democratic candidates. If they couldn't go for Truman, I don't see how in the world they can go for Kennedy in 1960.

WARREN ROGERS, JR.: **Well, how about another possibility of an entirely new party, a third party, a conservative party?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I would resist that. If we can create a third party in this country, then we can have dissidence appear in the third party, and we can create a fourth and a fifth party. I would much rather see us struggle to get a real two-party system going again.

WILLIAM S. WHITE: . . . **Senator Taft used to say often that he thought the Republicans lost elections because, as he put it, so many people, Republicans, stayed at home. Now, who are these stay-at-homes this time, in your judgment? You imply there are many. Who are they?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: They are in both parties. Unfortunately, the conservative mind, whether it's Democratic or Republican, takes an absolute position, and I think this is a mistake. They say—if the man does not fill their mold down to his finger tips, then they are not going to vote for him. Now, I find many, many people in the Democratic party who will not vote for Kennedy, and, on the other hand, they don't want to vote Republican, because their fathers haven't done it and their grandfathers haven't done it. It's just become a family tradition with them.

In the Republican side, well, in 1958, we had eight million fewer people vote for Republican candidates for the Congress or the House of Representatives . . . than in 1956. Now, the normal difference should have only been about three and a half million. So we might say that there are four and a half million people who were trying to express their dissatisfaction with the candidates by

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

staying home. But when they do that, they always get the man whose philosophy they disagree with the most.

Now, I don't know why they can't understand that, but—that prevails, and I know that there are large groups of conservatives in this country, in both parties, organized conservative groups, whose leaders are telling them daily—don't go to the polls.

MR. WHITE: **Don't go?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Don't go to the polls. And, I think it's a dreadful mistake; if we don't go to the polls, we always wind up with the candidates who are the worst for the country.

MR. WHITE: **Senator, by definition, doesn't that situation give you more alarm, your party more alarm, than the Democratic party—more cause for alarm?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes, because there are far more Democrats than there are Republicans.

MR. WHITE: **And far more conservatives who are Republicans, are there not?**

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No; I think you will find in this country that there are more conservatives than there are so-called liberals. I don't call them liberals because I find very few who really follow liberal philosophy. I would say they are radicals today but not the bomb-throwing type, but the type that want to go back to a centralized bureaucratic government. I can't relate them with liberalism.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Textbooks Are Weapons

But Whose Side Are They Serving?

By Rosalie M. Gordon

PUT YOURSELF for a moment in the position of an American mother who chanced one day to glance through her son's high school civics textbook. She was appalled to find 17 pages devoted to "Dating and Marriage," but little factual material, historical information, or theory on the fundamentals of American government. There was much about "solving current problems"—mostly through government action by law or money. The slant of the textbook was immediately obvious in a brashly loaded question at the end of one chapter: "Why do you think the Declaration of Human Rights (of the UN) is one of the world's greatest humanitarian documents?"

The mother—confused, angry, disturbed—tucked the book under her arm and marched over to her son's school. Her reception was something less than cordial. She was told that the textbook had been chosen by qualified educators. She received the scarcely hidden implication that they knew what they were doing and she did not. She was given a lecture in "fairness," "presenting all sides," "academic freedom"—all couched in an incomprehensible educationalese which left her more confused than ever and completely on the defensive.

Or take the case of a public-spirited businessman. He serves on his local school board. He has heard stories about slanted textbooks. Visiting friends in another city one day, he comes across a civic text which to him seems interesting, fair, objective, and full of the kind of knowledge and information essential to good citizenship in a republic. He goes back home and inquires why such a book is not in use in the high school whose affairs he helps administer. He gets pretty much the same reaction the mother got, with the added sly reminder that if the school board would vote more funds, maybe additional texts could be added. Being a businessman and not an "educator," he feels somewhat inadequate to argue further.

Yet the fact remains that growing amazement is expressed by many parents and employers at a strictly modern phenomenon. It occurs much too frequently among high school students and graduates, as well as among even college students. It consists of a complete lack of knowledge, or a badly distorted conception, of the American way of life. It is evident often in a glib (but inaccurate) "understanding" of the United Nations, but ignorance of the principles on which the American Republic was founded. It shows up in a sort of imbedded antipathy to so-called Big Business, but an acceptance and even approval of Big Government.

Several generations of young Americans, from whose ranks our current and future leaders must come, have been pouring out of our high schools. Too large a percentage of them have either no understanding or a completely false picture of the American free-enterprise economy operating under the American constitutional system of government. Along with this goes an equal misconception of the dangers to this system which flow from what might be called the worldwide "ism onslaught"—socialism, communism, one-worldism, etc.

The causes at the base of this deplorable situation are many of course. There seems little doubt that one of the major causes has been what used to be known as "progressive education"—now euphemistically termed "modern education." But along with the assault of the life-adjustors on our schools—even as part of their cult of educational mediocrity—there has been a little-noticed (until recently) root cause. It is the textbooks used in American high schools, particularly in that grab-basket known as the Social Sciences which includes the once separately treated subjects of civics or government, geography, history, political science, economics, etc.

This is not to say, of course, that all textbooks in use in our high schools are mediocre or unsound or bad. Neither does it mean that all textbooks are excellent, sound, and written from a basic desire to instruct the future citizens of the United States in the meaning and aims of the governmental and economic system under which they live—and out of which comes the taxes to support the public school systems.

THE BIG POINT is that textbooks are weapons in reaching, teaching, and molding the minds of our children. The next point follows naturally: How is one to tell which are the sound and which are the unsound texts? Even if you—the American taxpayers who support your local public schools—think you know, how do you make your knowledge effective? The treatment given that mother and that school board member may seem sad—even shocking. But after all, perhaps they were not the best judges of what are sound and what are unsound textbooks—though they were undoubtedly better judges than a good many educationists who are choosing your children's books.

It was out of this whole situation—and out of an additional startling fact—that there grew one of the finest educational projects to appear in the American scene in a long time. Several years ago, America's Future, Inc., 542 Main St., New Rochelle, N. Y.—a non-profit, educational organization with an eminent board of trustees—made an amazing discovery. America's Future had published several pamphlets on the general school situation. As a result, the organization began to get inquiries from interested parents, teachers, school board members and others about specific textbooks in use in their local high schools. America's Future at the time was in no position to answer these inquiries. It therefore looked around for an organization or publication to which these requests could be re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferred. *It could not find anywhere in the United States an authoritative, objective source which was reviewing or evaluating high school textbooks.* No wonder the leftists, the one-worlders, the modern educationists had had such a field day! No wonder authors and publishers of sound American texts were either discouraged from writing and issuing them in the first place or, if they did, encountered great difficulties in having them adopted in the schools.

America's Future decided to fill this gaping void. It set up the TEXTBOOK EVALUATION COMMITTEE of America's Future. This Committee is made up of more than a dozen distinguished American educators and writers.* Their job was, is, and will continue to be to analyze and review high school textbooks, primarily in the Social Sciences. There is only one purpose behind the work of the TEXTBOOK EVALUATION COMMITTEE: To provide for parents, school board members, teachers and all other interested parties that which they have never had before—an authoritative opinion on the context, slant (if any) and value of the books from which American youngsters are being taught.

There are completed and available to all interested citizens 50 evaluations or reviews. In addition, 22 are in process of completion, and another 50 textbooks have been assigned for review. Additional volumes will be covered as fast as funds and facilities permit.

*The members of the Textbook Evaluation Committee are: Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Le Moyne College; Dr. Neil Carothers, Lehigh University; Dr. Raymond English, Kenyon College; Dr. Medford Evans, formerly Northwestern State College; Dr. Mark Graubard, University of Minnesota; Dr. A. H. Hobbs, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Willmoore Kendall, Yale University; Dr. Russell Kirk, C. W. Post College; Dr. Ella Lonn, Goucher College; Dr. Marie Madden, New York City School System (retired); J. B. Matthews, Author and Lecturer; Dr. William M. McGovern, Northwestern University; Dr. Felix Morley, Author and Lecturer; Dr. E. Merrill Root, formerly Earlham College; Dr. Hans F. Sennholz, Grove City College and Dr. Charles Callan Tansill, formerly Georgetown University.

Character Determines A Nation's Strength

By Dorothy Thompson
From the Ladies Home Journal

No nation can long exist as a great one, if the industrious, strong, creative, self-reliant, ingenious and patriotic are penalized to the point of discouragement by being forced to carry the load of those who are not.

The character and not the standard of living of a people is determinent. The ultimate test of the Welfare State is whether it does, or does not, succeed in improving the national character, and fostering the primary virtues, which are the sterner ones of courage, determination, duty, fortitude and personal responsibility.

And there are always barbarians living within every society, even the most civilized. Nor can the most humane society protect itself by humanitarian ideals against those of its members who cannot or will not govern or restrain themselves. These cannot be self-governed.

Nixon's White Paper

During the third Nixon-Kennedy television debate, Vice President Richard Nixon answered Senator John Kennedy's charge that he had been "misquoted" by declaring he would issue a "white paper" quoting exactly what the Senator has said on key issues. The following Kennedy quotes, which are compared with the facts on the subject, were taken from the Vice President's promised "white paper."

Broadcasts to Latin America

The misstatement:

"We have beamed not a single Voice of America program in Spanish to all of Latin America in the last eight years except for the three months of the Hungarian Revolution."

The facts:

Through the United States Information Agency's Voice of America, Latin Americans receive 160,000 broadcast hours every year in both Spanish and Portuguese. These programs are recorded by the Voice of America, and are used by 1500 local stations throughout Latin America to reach medium-wave and long-wave listeners who constitute the overwhelmingly predominant portion of radio listeners. To reach the small short-wave audience the Voice of America contracted between 1953 and 1960 with Boston station WRUL to broadcast short-wave in Spanish and Portuguese to Latin America. Beginning this year, the Voice of America itself broadcasts every day by short wave in Spanish to Latin America. These broadcasts are heard by individual short-wave listeners. They are also picked up by some 75 Latin American local radio stations which relay the programs on their regular long-wave frequencies.

This record would have been even better had the United States Information Agency and its Voice of America been given all of the money recommended for them by the President. The Democratic-led Congress in every year since 1954 has made substantial cuts in the amount of money that the President requested for the United States Information Agency, including a total reduction of $87 million in annual operating funds.

Defense Spending

In the second debate Senator Kennedy said: "Mr. Nixon is wholly inaccurate when he says the Congress has not provided more funds in fact than the President recommended for national defense."

The facts:

The claim that Democratic Congresses did not cut President Eisenhower's defense budgets, but rather provided more than he asked, is contrary to the facts available in the Bureau of the Budget which show that over the past 6 years of Democratic Congressional control, the Congress cut the President's recommendations for new defense spending authority on net by $1.7 million.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED